



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

228

CRM-M-6817-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 13.05.2026

Puneet

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.292 dated 13.06.2025 registered under Section 309(4) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Badshahpur, District Gururgram, Haryana.

2. Briefly stated, petitioner has been alleged to have committed an offence under Section 309(4) alongwith co-accused, namely, Priya who robbed the complainant, a taxi driver and got transferred an amount of Rs.95,000/- by making his objectionable video after threatening him and putting him under fear of falsely implicating him in a harassment case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for concession of bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:

I. That the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 10 months.

II. That the offences are triable by Magistrate.



III. Complainant has already been examined and there is no apprehension that if the petitioner released on bail, he will tamper with the prosecution evidence.

IV. Petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal activity, except the present one.

V. The trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody.

4. Custody certificate of the petitioner filed by learned State counsel today in Court, is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is behind bars since 24.06.2025 i.e. for the last 10 months and 19 days.

5. Learned State Counsel opposed the present petition on the following grounds:

I. The petitioner, along with co-accused is involved in a heinous crime, wherein they allegedly robbed a taxi driver and got a sum of Rs.95,000/- transferred from the complainant, besides taking away his mobile phone. It is further alleged that they also recorded an objectionable video with co-accused Priya and attempted to collect additional material benefits.

II. The allegations are supported by Call Detail Records (CDRs) and location data, which place the petitioner at the relevant place of occurrence.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds merits in the present petition on the following grounds:



I. The petitioner has been behind bars since 24.06.2025 i.e. for the last more than 10 months.

II. Petitioner has clean and clear antecedents and he is not involved in any other case except the present one.

III. Complainant has already been examined and there is no apprehension that if the petitioner released on bail, he will tamper with the prosecution evidence.

IV. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude.

V. No fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period.

8. As concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is a rule, jail is an exception. Hence, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

13.05.2026

Geeta

**(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No